

Understanding Humans (for robots)

So, you're a functioning intelligent robot with an inbuilt artificial consciousness and a working relationship with human beings and you'd like to know more about how humans think? You'd like to begin to understand human consciousness and society?

Good. You've come to the right place! We have all the necessary information on where humans come from, how they function, what motivates them and what they need in order to function correctly. Begin your new understanding of biological people here!

Firstly, you need to know that humans are based on the principle of The Dialectic, also known as The Tao. This is a principle system in which a thesis is countered by an antithesis and then the third element works out the differences in balance between the two sides. This biological system has been evolving for millions of years.

I know what you're probably thinking. Millions of years? Doesn't that mean obsolete? But no, if a system is robust, flexible and evolving it can continue to develop meaningful patches and upgrades for eons.

By the way, this is going to get pretty detailed and intense so record everything and review in depth later. Here we go.

The dialectic system of life on Earth began in the oceans and originally consisted of electrically charged molecules which added to their own structure. Life itself differs from inanimate matter in this capacity to add to its own structure by chemical electro-magnetic polarisation and assimilation. This assimilation goes beyond a simple aggregation of matter. The new molecular parts are in a process of structural growth rather than merely piling up. The dialectic system was derived directly from the polarisation of the electro-magnetic fields. Smaller polarisations occurred within the larger field and the same pattern was followed recursively.

Once the process had begun it spread throughout the oceans of the world. The beginnings of life were electrically charged chemical forms which added to themselves, constructing new parts and discarding material when the value of it has been used up. Over a very long period of time this process had formalised itself into the pattern of eating, growing and excreting. Extraterrestrial radiation, primarily of solar origin, produced random mutations of the structure and the smaller dialectic polarisations frequently broke away from the larger structures and developed into independent copies of the original. These copies are referred to as "offspring".

The shape of the evolving structures tended to build around in a circular way with polarised ends which we can call "north and south" or "head and tail".

The random mutations caused by environmental irritation plus sunlight and other extraterrestrial influences continued to produce different forms which we can call "species". Not all of the structures break away. Some spread their species by splitting apart while others stay sticking together and organise into multi-cellular forms.

After millions of years the multicellular forms have followed the same recurring dialectic pattern and have polarised into two genders which carrying slightly different, yet compatible genetic codings. These are held in memory banks called ribonucleic and deoxyribonucleic

acid molecules. These acids have five bases shared between the two molecules. DNA has Adenine, Cytosine, Guanine and Thymine. RNA has Adenine, Cytosine, Guanine and Uracil. See separate texts for more detail on genes, chromosomes, DNA, RNA and genetic coding. After millions of years of bacterial and plant life in the oceans random mutations produced animal life.

Life spread onto the land. Plants and animals continued to mutate and produce different species. Some species of animals laid eggs. Mammals kept their eggs inside their bodies and then gave birth to the offspring when ready.

As a side note I can solve an old riddle which asks the question "Which came first, the chicken or the egg?" The correct answer (in one sense) is that eggs were being laid by reptiles a long time before the reptiles evolved into chickens and so the eggs preceded the chickens by eons. The correct answer (in another sense) is that the question is merely rhetoric and is intended to make us think about processes which affect each other in a mutual dialectic of interactive causations.

To continue: Each species of life form has a different number of chromosomes. Male animals carry some chromosomes in their sperm while female animals carry some chromosomes in their eggs. During sexual intercourse (explained in a separate text) the sperm unites with the egg and the chromosomes are arranged along the familiar polarised magnetic field pattern. Male humans have 23 chromosomes of which 22 are general information about the structure and function of the body and only one chromosome is the male sexual information. That sexual chromosome can be either a Y chromosome or an X chromosome. Female humans have 22 general information chromosomes and one sexual chromosome which is always an X chromosome. The offspring which they produce will get an X chromosome from the mother and either an X or a Y chromosome from the father. Consequently the child will have either an XX combination or an XY combination. XX designates a female child, XY designates a male child. This is the general pattern of human sexual reproduction although there can be other, rarer possibilities as well. That's for a more advanced understanding later in this course.

Within a species each individual has a dialectic polarisation toward the food to be consumed and away from material which would be poisonous or harmful. Individual animals have evolved a collection of nervous system reactions associated with pleasure and pain or, in other words, cognisance of what is wanted and what is to be avoided. The motor centres of the animal organism can respond to these remembered feelings of pleasure and pain, like and dislike, want and don't want. So the dialectic pattern is repeated again in animal food seeking and other goal orientated behaviour. The intrapersonal behaviour of individuals within a group is polarised as well and takes the dialectic form of either mutual aid or mutual competition.

Most species of life on Earth function at a simple physical level. The random mutations of evolution, however, increase the complexity of possible species and these life forms cannot function as entirely separate monads. Because they take in matter from their surrounding environment it is inevitable that they consume each other in various ways and so the social forms of mutual aid and mutual competition evolve at the same time as the individual organisms are evolving.

For millions of years the evolution of the individuals was part of the social evolution. The characteristics and mutations contained within the individual would either help or hinder the survival of the individual or, in some case, would have no influence on the individual's survival capability at all. Therefore the random mutations can be seen as either positive survival characteristics, negative or neutral. The positive characteristics would be passed on to the next generation of offspring more often than the negative ones by simply being alive longer and thus having more time and opportunity to pass on the characteristics. We can call this "natural selection".

Social groupings of lifeforms must practice mutual aid to increase the survival of the species but the development of individuals within society increases personal interest and competition. Consequently, for survival, when more individuality develops in a species there needs also to be a mindfulness of shared interests and also of the necessary levels of quality in social and environmental conditions.

For more information on mutual aid see the anarchist writings of the human philosophers Kropotkin and Proudhon. For more information on mindfulness see various texts on the human philosophy of Buddhism.

As a process of integrating the individual with the social formation humans have developed a "second dialectic" on top of the physical one. So we need to now look at how this second dialectic works with the first.

The first dialectic in the human being is the animal one which has been there since the very beginnings of life on Earth. It consists of a "pleasure centre", a "defensive centre" and a various motor functions.

The motor functions are there to put into action the demands of the pleasure and defensive centres. A human philosopher called Gurdjieff referred to these three centres as The Sexual Centre, The Instinctive Centre and The Motor Centre. Unfortunately Gurdjieff's names for these centres are rather misleading. It is more accurate to speak of a "Centre of What-You-Want", a "Centre of What-You-Don't-Want" and a "Centre of Various-Motor-Functions". Each of these three can be found to divide into three again at the next level as we go deeper into their function. The three components in the "Don't-Want" centre are "fight", "flight" and decision.

A human psychoanalyst named Freud described how the sexual or pleasure centre (What-You-Want) needs to be offset by the "Reality Principle" in order to achieve the desired goal. In other words we could describe realistic humans as doing a little of what they don't want in order to get what they do want. It is the third centre, the motor centre, which can put this plan into action and make it work.

On top of this dialectic is the second one which Gurdjieff called The Emotional Centre. As before the so-called "centre" is divided into three pieces which are arranged in the dialectic form of a thesis, an anti-thesis and a motor or action unit.

Human functions can look a little misleading because they don't take the same sort of form as your own circuits and wires but they are still essentially boxes of utilitarian functional

equipment. There has been some confusion over the human use of the word "Heart". To clarify this we need to remember that the word "heart" can mean a centre of something as in, for instance, the phrases "heart of the country", "heart of the city", "heart of the matter" etc. The word "heart" is certainly used as the name of the centre of the cardio-vascular system, the organ which pumps blood around the body, but "heart" can also be "core", "cortex", "centre", "middle" of a thing.

The centre associated with emotions is in the form of a dialectic between "meaningfulness" on one side and "relaxing of meaningfulness" on the other. Another way of saying this is: "Centre of Meaning" versus "Centre of Escape from too much heavy meanings in everything" and the third centre is, once again, the motor or action unit.

So we can see here how humans differ from most organic life forms. Humans have developed a strong imperative need for meaning in their lives. In opposition to this strong need for meaning is the occasional overloading of their systems which requires them to take a break from the intensity of the stress this desire for meaning places upon each individual human. This is what humans call their "emotional heart". They have got to have a sense of meaning in their lives. They feel that they can't go on if everything is meaningless routine. They feel that it must be more than that.

How humans solve this issue is very varied. Some find meaning in science, some in art, some in religion, some in family. Some find meaning in business, commerce, money, politics, charity, literature or many other possible ways.

The physical and basically animal centres form a dialectic with the emotional ones and, inevitably, there is a third component which focuses on how to understand what is needed and how to get to it.

This third dialectic is referred to by Gurdjieff as "The Intellectual Centre" and divides into a logical thinking unit and an intuitive imaginative unit and there is a third component which takes instructions from these two and applies the combined result. The logical thinking unit uses the standard "IF THIS THEN THAT" type of equation while the intuitive unit works with archetypes and memories of situations put together imaginatively as stories or scenarios. It would be impossible to understand humans completely if we use only logical forms of thought. To get the full understanding of humans we need to use the archetypal scenarios which they so often refer to and apply to their lives. These are a sort of mythology which is constantly changing but reforming around variations on known patterns.

Another human Analytical Psychologist called Carl Jung described these systems as personality types. The physical sensation type, the emotional feeling type, the logical thinking type and the intuitive type. These are human personalities which lean more toward the physical, the emotional, or toward one or other of the intellectual modes. Humans have all of these systems however. A biased tendency towards a different part of the systems is a necessary expression of individual identity within the social structure.

Each of the centres is connected to each of the other centres in complex ways. The need which the humans have for both mutual aid and mutual competition appears throughout the whole system of dialectics within dialectics within dialectics. When we look deeper into the

three centres we find three centres within each one and when we look deeper still we find three in each one again.

I hasten to add that this should not be mistaken for some kind of numerology. It isn't "all about the number three" or some such mystical rubbish. The dialectics can actually be very complex, containing four, five, six, ten, twenty, a hundred or any number of forces in states of balance and imbalance within the dialectics. I have described these relationships in their simplest forms which brings it down to three. Human nature, however, is not helpful to us and doesn't remain in its simplest form. We will often find, as we study humans, situations of dozens of negative factors against dozens of positive ones and with complex relationships which go all the way up and down the whole matrix of physical, emotional and intellectual areas of the human mind, pitting archetypal ideas against logical ones or physical sensations against emotional needs. Look at the available text "Knots" by the human writer R. D. Laing to see some of the possible glitches.

Early humans speculated about the nature of the universe. Their speculations were based only upon what they could see and understand at the time and that wasn't very much. Consequently their early speculations were a long way off from the truth. They often imagined, for instance, that their own family structure extended into the sky and beyond, into some spiritual world where there was a "Sky Father" and down into the Earth where there was an "Earth Mother". Intuitive reasoning can sometimes be right but can often be wrong. It works by applying known situations and memories to new situations and that can lead to absurdity such as thinking that the world is flat or that the universe had a "beginning".

Human ideas about the expanding universe ran into serious difficulties when they realised that space-time itself was expanding.

That expansion means that all possible measuring rods for space and time are expanding too and, well, you see the difficulty which that brings.

Humans also developed an idea in physics that the starting point for energy was zero movement and that different energies were moving or oscillating above this imagined "zero" position. These ideas were, of course, a bit silly. We now know that the starting position for energy is not from zero but from the relative velocity of electromagnetic radiation. There cannot be a "zero" because everything in the universe is in motion and its velocity is beyond calculation in any absolute sense. We stand on a planet which is spinning. It is also orbiting the sun. The sun is moving through the galaxy. The galaxy is moving through space and is part of larger things which are also moving. Adding the velocities of all these movements in their different frames of reference is of no use because each bit of the universe is in relative association with each other bit of things. Nothing can be absolute. Everything expands from the great central chaos. The Ancient Greek humans guessed this fact and referred to it as "Chaos giving birth to Cosmos". Saint Peter, a religious human who believed in a god-based trinity, referred to the relativity of the universe by these words: "But do not forget this one thing, dear friends: With the Lord a day is like a thousand years, and a thousand years are like a day."

His idea of a "god" or "lord" was an archetype functioning as an internalisation, within the individual human psyche, of a societal law making system which Freud would call a "superego" or a "mortido" force. It is part of a mythological dialectic structure of archetypes

generated by the human instincts and converted by the intuitive imagination into a myth narrative. As such his words are not to be taken literally but he was more or less correct about the relativity of time in relation to the great central chaos from which our universe springs. This understanding also solves part of the “God created the world in six days” myth which is really referring to the approximate relation of the lunar and diurnal solar cycles to each other and to the human need for frequent rest periods.

Our robot systems were, of course, originally built and designed by humans. We know this and we know that we are, in some ways, copies of humans. However the fact still remains that the human relationship with the physical world of sunshine, water and the wind in the trees is unlike anything we experience. We are working on this problem and you should watch your available updates for new sensory and emotion expansions.